

REMARKS

In the amendment presented above, claims 1-3, 16, 27, 28 and 42 have also been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the term “signal stream” in the claims.

Claims 56-58 are objected to for using the phrase “such that” and are rejected under 35 USC 112, first and second paragraphs. Applicant has amended these claims to address the issues identified by the Examiner.

Claims 1-3, 6-8, 16, 27-29, 42 and 56-58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over Saint Etienne et al. in view of Kauschke et al. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s analysis of the claims and requests reconsideration in light of the remarks below.

More specifically, claim 1 recites, *inter alia*,

“... receiving PDUs (protocol data units) from multiple signal streams at a first MAC (media access control) client;  
... providing a plurality of buffers uniquely associated with the multiple signal streams supplying PDUs to the first MAC client;  
for each given PDU decapsulated from the MAC frames received at the second MAC client, forwarding the given PDU to a select one of said plurality of buffers that is associated with the signal stream from which the given PDU originated in accordance with the identifier of the MAC frame from which the given PDU was decapsulated;  
monitoring a fullness condition of each one of said plurality of buffers; and  
transmitting a Pause control frame from the second MAC client to the first MAC client, the Pause control frame indicating the fullness condition of each one of said plurality of buffers.” (emphasis added)

Nowhere does the cited prior art teach or suggest these features.

The Examiner asserts that col. 3, lines 44-52 of Saint Etienne describes the operations of **“providing a plurality of buffers uniquely associated with the multiple signal streams supplying PDUs to the first MAC client”** and **“forwarding the given PDU to a select one of said plurality of buffers that is associated with the signal stream from which the given PDU originated in accordance with the identifier of the MAC frame from which the given PDU was decapsulated.”** Such analysis is clearly flawed. Col. 3, lines 44-52 of Saint Etienne describes a “sampling service” and a “queuing service” as part of a switched full duplex Ethernet type communication network between source and destination subscriber equipment. In the “sampling service,” the destination subscriber equipment only presents the last received value to the user. In the “queuing service,” the destination subscriber equipment presents all data that it receives to the user. Nowhere does Col. 3, lines 44-52 of Saint Etienne teach or suggest **“providing a plurality of buffers uniquely associated with the multiple signal streams supplying PDUs to the first MAC client”** and **“forwarding the given PDU to a select one of said plurality of buffers that is associated with the signal stream from which the given PDU originated in accordance with the identifier of the MAC frame from which the given PDU was decapsulated”** as required by claim 1. Kauschke et al. does not remedy the shortcomings of Saint Etienne.

The Examiner further asserts that paragraph 50, lines 1-8 of Kauschke et al. describes “transmitting a Pause control frame from the second MAC client to the first

MAC client, **the Pause control frame indicating the fullness condition of each one of said plurality of buffers**” as recited by claim 1. Such analysis is clearly flawed as paragraph 50, lines 1-8 of Kauschke et al. and supporting Figure 3 describes the generation of a Pause control frame in response to the indication that a single FIFO buffer 312 is full. It does not contemplate the generation of a “Pause control frame indicating **the fullness condition of each one of said plurality of buffers**”, let alone where such plurality of buffers are “**uniquely associated with the multiple signal streams supplying PDUs to the first MAC client**” as recited by claim 1.

For these reasons, claim 1 recites features that are not taught or suggested by the cited prior art. Accordingly, claim 1 is clearly patentable over the cited prior art. Similar arguments apply to independent claims 16, 27 and 42.

The dependent claims are patentable over the cited prior art for those reasons advanced above with respect to claims 1, 16, 27 and 42 from which they respectively depend and for reciting additional features that are not taught or suggested by the cited prior art.

In light of all of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in order for allowance, and prompt allowance is earnestly requested. Should any issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney of record so that the case may proceed expeditiously to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay P. Sbrollini  
Reg. No. 36,266  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C.  
60 Long Ridge Road  
Suite 407  
Stamford, CT 06902  
(203) 323-1800

July 8, 2009